

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

March 27, 2012

The Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Mayor Earling in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Dave Earling, Mayor
Strom Peterson, Council President
Frank Yamamoto, Councilmember
Joan Bloom, Councilmember
Lora Petso, Councilmember
Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Councilmember
Diane Buckshnis, Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT

Phil Williams, Public Works Director
Shawn Hunstock, Finance Director
Carrie Hite, Parks & Recreation Director
Carl Nelson, CIO
Jeff Taraday, City Attorney
Sandy Chase, City Clerk
Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst.
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

ELECTED OFFICIALS ABSENT

Michael Plunkett, Councilmember

1. CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING LABOR NEGOTIATIONS PER RCW 42.30.140(4)(b), AND POTENTIAL LITIGATION PER RCW 42.30.110(1)(i).

At 5:30 p.m., Mayor Earling announced that the City Council would convene in executive session regarding labor negotiations per RCW 42.30.140(4)(b), and potential litigation per RCW 42.30.110(1)(i). He stated that the executive session was scheduled to last approximately 90 minutes and would be held in the Jury Meeting Room, located in the Public Safety Complex. No action was anticipated to occur as a result of meeting in executive session. Elected officials present at the executive session were: Mayor Earling, and Councilmembers Yamamoto, Fraley-Monillas, Buckshnis, Peterson, Petso and Bloom. Others present were City Attorney Jeff Taraday, Attorney Sharon Cates, Attorney Mark Bucklin, Parks, Recreation Director Carrie Hite, Human Resources Consultant Tara Adams, Police Chief Al Compaan and City Clerk Sandy Chase. At 7:00 p.m., Mayor Earling announced to the public present in the Council Chambers that an additional 15 minutes would be required in executive session. The executive session concluded at 7:10 p.m.

Mayor Earling reconvened the regular City Council meeting at 7:15 p.m. and led the flag salute.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED 5-0. (Councilmember Bloom was not present for the vote.)

2. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER YAMAMOTO, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED 5-0. (Councilmember Bloom was not present for the vote.) The agenda items approved are as follows:

- A. ROLL CALL
- B. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 20, 2012,
- C. APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #131107 THROUGH #131226 DATED MARCH 22, 2012 FOR \$235,481.61. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL DIRECT DEPOSIT AND CHECKS #51245 THROUGH #51269 FOR THE PERIOD MARCH 1, 2012 THROUGH MARCH 15, 2012 FOR \$632,283.98,
- D. ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF A CLAIM FOR DAMAGES FROM GENE ERICSON (\$9,640.00),
- E. AUTHORIZATION FOR MAYOR TO SIGN A RELEASE OF LIEN FOR A CLAIM OF LIEN FILED BY THE CITY OF EDMONDS IN 1997 (GOLDIE'S OF EDMONDS),

4. **AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

There were no members of the public present who wished to speak.

5. **HUMAN RESOURCES REORGANIZATION**

Mayor Earling explained the Council previously approved an outline of the Human Resources Department reorganization. Tonight's proposal has two parts, 1) reclassify the Human Resources Analyst, Mary Ann Hardie, to Human Resources Manager on a permanent basis, and 2) add Chapter 2.21 to the Edmonds City Code, Special Duty Pay. This gives the mayor the authority to temporarily assign managers and directors special and/or additional duties that are outside the scope of their normal everyday duties and to compensate them for this additional work. This flexibility will be important as the City continues to experience budget difficulties.

COUNCILMEMBER PETSO MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS, TO APPROVE THE MAYOR'S PROPOSAL TO RECLASSIFY MARY ANN HARDIE AS HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER.

City Attorney Jeff Taraday pointed out tonight is a study session and there is not an action item before the Council. If the Council concurred with the administration's proposal, the intent was to return with a budget amendment and ordinance necessary to finalize the action.

COUNCILMEMBER PETSO WITHDREW HER MOTION WITH THE AGREEMENT OF THE SECOND.

Councilmember Petso expressed her support for the Mayor's proposal to reclassify Ms. Hardie as Human Resources Manager.

Councilmember Petso expressed concern and stated she was not inclined to approve the proposed ordinance without some significant changes. Under no circumstances could she face the public to say the Council had given authority for up to a 10% raise for directors anytime they "set one foot outside their written job description" as stated in the Mayor's proposal. That was too loose for her to approve. Although the intent may be to compensate on a temporary basis, the ordinance states on a temporary or permanent basis. It was her opinion that if a director was asked to cover another position, that position either needed to be filled by another person or the job needed to be eliminated and the duties assigned elsewhere. She was not in favor of the concept of continually increasing employees' pay because they were asked to do too many jobs. The result is tired directors who are trying to do too much and a lower level of service to citizens.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether there was a personnel policy that addressed special duty pay with a 5% discretionary limit. Mr. Taraday responded Councilmember Buckshnis may be referring to the acting pay provision in the 2011 salary ordinance. That ordinance allows for a 5% pay increase when an existing employee acts in the capacity of a vacant director position. An example of that is Rob Chave, an existing employee, the Planning Manager, who is the acting Development Services Director on a temporary basis. That provision is for a vacant budgeted position and not intended for this situation where duties are assigned that are outside the director's normal job description.

Councilmember Buckshnis responded she was not referring to the 2011 salary ordinance; there is a personnel policy that allows the Mayor to provide a 5% discretionary pay increase. Parks & Recreation/Interim Human Resources Director Carrie Hite explained the personnel policy contains discretion for the Mayor to provide an increase for employees in acting positions similar to what Mr. Taraday described as well as working out of class. She explained out of class means an employee working at a higher level than their current position; they receive either a 5% increase or the bottom of that position's salary range, whichever is higher.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether Ms. Hite was acting out of class since she is the director of Parks & Recreation and acting as Human Resources Director. Ms. Hite answered it is a parallel level, therefore the provision in the personnel policy does not apply.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked if Finance Director Shawn Hunstock, who also manages the IT Department, receives special duty pay. Mr. Taraday assumed Mr. Hunstock's job description includes supervision of the IT Department. It is not a special duty if it is included in his job description, even if it is seemingly two different departments. The question is whether what a director is being asked to do is part of their job description or not. The proposed ordinance addresses a director who is being asked to do something outside their job description.

Councilmember Buckshnis preferred that this had been reviewed by the Finance Committee. Although she agreed this may be needed, she was concerned with the proposed 10% increase when the personnel policy was 5%. Mayor Earling responded the 10% was not a magical number to him; it was simply a number and could have been 5% or 8%. The reason for this discussion was to solicit the Council's input.

Council President Peterson pointed out the 10% is not a guarantee, that is the limit of the Mayor's discretion. The Mayor has certain duties and obligations in his capacity as Mayor; this is one of those. The Mayor is as aware as anyone of the budget constraints. With continuing budgetary constraints there may be future reorganizations and this provides the Mayor the ability to make incremental changes without making a request to Council every time.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas asked if these situations would be presented to Council when they occurred. Mr. Taraday answered that could be added to the ordinance if the Council wished; there is nothing in the ordinance now that requires Council notification. The ordinance as proposed authorizes the mayor to compensate for special duty pay when he/she deems it necessary. He clarified the amount could be anything from ½% to 10%, depending on the extent to which the mayor feels additional duties are being performed. This is being presented to the Council at a study session to solicit the Council's feedback prior to finalizing the ordinance.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas suggested if/when special duty pay is provided, the Council be notified before it occurs. In the current situation, Ms. Hite has a full-time job as Parks & Recreation Director as well as additional duties of another department. That saves the City the cost of the FTE for that additional position. Because of the savings, it is a good plan for the future and it is fair to compensate someone when they assume much additional responsibility. She was not concerned with the proposed 10% increase, but wanted the Council to be notified in advance.

Councilmember Bloom stated Council approval should be required for increases up to 10% and reorganizations that require an increase in an employee's salary of 10%. The proposed ordinance does not state an increase of 5-10% would require Council approval. A 10% increase in a manager's salary was potentially \$10,000, a significant enough amount that the Council and the citizens should be informed of the increase and what the reorganization will accomplish. She recommended the Council be notified of an increase of 5-10% as well as provided a description of the organization and what it will accomplish.

Councilmember Buckshnis suggested either this proposal or the personnel policy be revised so that they were consistent at 5%. She recalled the Council previously discussed that the increase could only last for six months. Mr. Taraday responded staff discussed the potential need to permanently assign duties that were once assigned to a position that is no longer funded. The proposal allows for that to occur on a permanent basis with an eye toward downsizing government.

Councilmember Buckshnis reiterated her suggestion to either change the personnel policy or this proposal so they are consistent. Mr. Taraday explained there are two provisions in the personnel policies that relate to a 5% pay increase, 1) acting out of class, and 2) acting in the capacity of a vacant position, neither of which apply to this specific situation. Therefore, the policies are not in conflict with each other. The Council could change the proposed percentage if they wished.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether the personnel policies should be updated to reflect what may be a trend of a director taking on additional duties or adding a special duty pay provision. Ms. Hite answered she is currently working on updating the personnel policies to include all the ordinances that have been passed over the last 3-5 years. That will be presented to the Mayor in the next couple weeks for review and to the Council shortly thereafter. Whatever ordinances are passed, they will be included in the update of the personnel policies.

Councilmember Petso pointed out a consultant is working a non-represented employee salary survey. She suggested waiting until the results of the salary survey are provided.

Council President Peterson suggested the ordinance include a provision that the Personnel Committee be informed when the Mayor assigns special duty pay. If the Council does not approve, the Council still has budget authority.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas agreed the non-represented salary survey had not yet been completed, but in fairness to the employees involved, she encouraged Council to move forward with the proposed ordinance. The Council can make revisions when the salary survey is completed or if other problems arise.

Councilmember Bloom pointed out the ordinance refers to Edmonds City Code Title 2, City Officials and Personnel. The Council approved Mr. Chave as Acting Director of Development Services; that position is a City official. The shortcut that was taken in the process of approving him as an Acting Development Services Director was Council was supposed to interview the final three candidates for City officials. This ordinance preempts that process by including City officials as well as allowing the mayor to consider whether such special duties are being assigned on a temporary or permanent basis. She concluded the authority granted in the proposed ordinance is too broad. The Council should have the ability to approve the appointment of any City official, whether temporary or permanent. Mr. Taraday responded if the Council did not adopt the ordinance and it was deemed necessary to assign someone additional duties and pay them additional compensation, a fairly cumbersome process is required that includes returning to the Council with a revised job description.

Alternatively, if the Council determined special duty pay provided too broad discretion, the Parks & Recreation Director job description could be revised to include the Human Resources-related duties Ms. Hite has been performing along with a budget amendment that reflects additional compensation. That could be done every time this type of situation arises. The administration's proposal was to create a more flexible tool that would be more responsive to the needs of the administration when things need to happen that are not within anyone's current job description.

Councilmember Bloom asked Mr. Taraday to review how that would work with the appointment of the Acting Development Services Director. Mr. Taraday responded that is a different situation because the 2011 budget included funds for an Acting Development Services Director. Assuming there is no money in the 2013 budget for a Development Services Director yet there is still a need for someone to supervise that department, there would be an acting out of class situation with a manager doing director duties and the proposed special duty pay ordinance would apply. More analogous to the current situation would be if the 2013 budget did not include money for a Development Services Director and Mr. Clifton was assigned to supervise the department; a director given additional director duties.

Councilmember Bloom observed the proposed ordinance would allow the mayor to determine who was in that position and leave the Council out of the decision. Mr. Taraday responded by eliminating a director position, the Council essentially took itself out of the confirmation process; the Council has only given itself the ability to confirm directors. In order to have the ability to confirm a director, the Council must fund the director position.

Councilmember Bloom assumed the proposed process would not be used very often as few reorganizations were likely to occur. She felt a 5-10% pay increase should be presented to the Council. Mr. Taraday responded that was a policy position the Council could take and it would eliminate the need for the ordinance. Councilmember Bloom asked if the proposed ordinance could be revised to reflect the Council's intent. Mr. Taraday noted at some point it would defeat the purpose of the ordinance. If staff needed to return to the Council for approval of special duty pay, they may as well come to Council with a budget amendment. The proposed ordinance was intended to streamline these types of relatively small pay adjustments.

Councilmember Yamamoto agreed with the proposal to streamline and give the mayor the ability to make smaller decisions. He suggested rather than a presentation to full Council, it be presented to the Finance or Personnel Committee and then approved on the consent agenda.

Councilmember Buckshnis commented if the 10% increase resulted in the mayor spending over his appropriation, it would need to be presented to the Council. She asked if the Human Resources Department had sufficient funds for special duty pay for Ms. Hite. Ms. Hite explained the previous proposal approved by Council contained a 5% increment, not 10%. The proposed ordinance would implement the policy related to special duty pay. Councilmember Buckshnis asked if special duty pay will come from the Human Resources Department appropriation. Ms. Hite answered yes, from salaries and wages. A budget amendment related to the Human Resources Department reorganization will be presented to Council next week.

Councilmember Buckshnis preferred the proposal be reviewed by the Finance Committee.

Councilmember Petso expressed her support for review by the Finance Committee. If the Council wanted a full-time Parks & Recreation Director but circumstances required that director to take on duties of another department, she asked whether there was anything the Council could do or was that an administrative decision. Mr. Taraday answered the Council has authority regarding job descriptions.

Mayor Earling pointed out the City is projected to have an \$800,000 - \$1,000,000 shortfall by 2013. In 2016-2017, that amount increases to \$3.5 million/year. There may be a need to make adjustments within staff that will require a more agile process than currently exists. He envisioned that bringing back every manager and director decision to the Council for review would bring the City to a grinding halt, a process he was not interested in participating in. There must be the ability for the mayor to make quick decisions in order to move quickly. With regard to the discretionary 10% increase, Mayor Earling explained both Ms. Hite and Mr. Chave have a 5% adjustment. He pointed out none of the non-represented employees have received a pay increase because he was trying to be strategic in how/when money was spent. He concluded it would be very difficult to operate the City efficiently if he was required to come to Council with every personnel decision. He did not object to having the Finance Committee review the proposal.

Council President Peterson summarized the proposal would be scheduled for the April 10 Finance Committee meeting and tentatively for full Council on April 17.

6. AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE ONE (1) NEW ELGIN J CROSSWIND REGENERATIVE AIR STREET SWEEPER FROM OWEN EQUIPMENT.

Public Works Director Phil Williams advised this is a normal replacement of one of the City's two street sweepers. The City will be surplus a 2001 Elgin J Crosswind sweeper that was anticipated to be replaced on a 7 year cycle but was extended to 11 years. The maintenance costs in time and service indicate it is now time for replacement. The proposal is to buy a new Elgin J Crosswind from Owen Machinery, the exclusive distributor for this product in the Northwest. It will be purchased via a local government bidding process that occurred in Houston that results in a very competitive price. The cost is \$251,762, less a \$25,000 trade-in, for a total cost of \$226,762 from the 511 Fund.

It was the consensus of the Council to schedule this for approval on next week's consent agenda.

7. METROPOLITAN PARK DISTRICT EXPLORATORY DISCUSSION

Parks & Recreation Director Carrie Hite explained Finance Director Shawn Hunstock and she have been discussing the concept of a Metropolitan Park District (MPD) and would like to introduce it as an exploratory subject. She noted the information she provided was presented at the Washington Recreation & Parks Association annual conference and was prepared by Jesse Richardson, City of Sammamish.

Ms. Hite provided the following information:

- Legislative history of MPDs
 - MPDs were first authorized in 1907
 - This legislation allowed for the creation of the state's first MPD, which is now Metro Parks Tacoma
 - In the interim, other forms of park financing districts were authorized by the legislature including:
 - Parks and Recreation Service Areas
 - Park and Recreation Districts
 - 2011 - Legislature created a task force to investigate ways to finance local parks and recreation agencies.
 - One conclusion of the task force was that MPD rules needed to be liberalized
 - 2002 – New legislation drafted and passed that made it much easier to form MPDs. Prior to 2002, cities under 5,000 and counties could not create MPDs.
- Purpose – An MPD may be created for the management, control, improvement, maintenance, and acquisition of parks, parkways, boulevards, and recreational facilities
 - Cultural arts cannot be funded via MPD
- Advantages of an MPD

- Boundary is flexible
 - May include both city and county jurisdictions
- Governance is simplified
 - City Council or County Council or combination may govern the MPD
- Simple majority vote to form
- Levy up to \$0.75 per \$1000 assessed value (AV)
- Further up on the list of junior taxing districts
- Permanent
- Current MPDs
 - Tacoma (1909)
 - Pullman (2002)
 - Si View-North Bend (2003)
 - Bainbridge Island (2004)
 - Eastmont-Douglas County (2004)
 - Key Peninsula (2004)
 - Peninsula (2004)
 - Greater Clark (2005)
 - Fall City (2009)
 - William Shore-Clallam County (2009)
 - Des Moines (2009)
 - Normandy Park (2009)
 - Shelton (2010)
 - Village Green (2010)
 - Tukwila (2011)

Ms. Hite described the regional MPD model:

- Governance options:
 - Independent
 - Board of Commissioners
 - County Council
 - If boundary does not include a City
 - Combo City/County
 - Each governing body designates representatives to serve in an ex-official capacity
- Service Options
 - General Purpose
 - Everything parks and recreation
 - Regional services
 - Local services excluded such as neighborhood parks
 - Special purpose
 - Capital or M&O only
- Who is using the Regional Model?
 - Metro Parks Tacoma
 - Greater Clark
 - Si View Metro Parks
 - Clallam County
- Greater Clark MPD, Vancouver WA
 - Established February 2005
 - Formed because:
 - Looming threat of significant impact fee refund for County
 - General Fund maintenance resources unavailable for County
 - Capital funding seamless and secure between jurisdictions
 - Unincorporated Clark County

- County Council is MPD Board
- Built 35 parks, 7-8 miles of trails
- Levy rate of \$0.26 per \$1000 AV
- Election Results:
 - 38% voter turnout
 - 50.05% approval (27 votes)
- Si View Metro Parks, North Bend WA
 - Established February 2003
 - Formed because:
 - King County announced it was closing the Si View Community Center and Pool
 - Only public pool and community center in the Snoqualmie Valley
 - Crisis
 - Standalone MPD
 - Board of Commissioners
 - Independent of the city and county
 - Levy rate of \$0.53/\$1000 AV
 - Well supported
 - 43% voter turnout
 - 71% approval
- Disadvantages of a Regional MPD
 - A lot of territory to serve
 - Levy rate limitations
 - Capital funding limitations
 - Difficult for a start-up/independent MPD
 - Local control/governance
- Advantages of a Regional MPD
 - Efficiencies (staff, equipment, etc.)
 - One stop shopping for customers
 - Unincorporated county residents are paying for services

Ms. Hite described the local MPD model:

- City boundaries
- Governance:
 - City Council
 - Funding tool only
 - Independent
 - Board of Commissioners
- Service options
 - General Purpose
 - Everything parks and recreation
 - Special purpose
 - Capital and M&O only
- Pullman MPD, Pullman WA
 - Formed September 2002
 - Formed because:
 - City facing a 1.7 million shortfall for calendar year 2003
 - Unable to sustain Parks & Recreation Department
 - Parks and Recreation utilized a large portion of the General Fund budget
 - City Council serves as Board
 - Levy rate of \$0.39/\$1000 AV
 - Well supported
 - 60% approval

Ms. Hite provided additional information regarding the formation of a MPD:

- MPDs may be proposed by local government or by citizen petition
- If the County is involved, Boundary Review Board review is required
- Ballot proposition:
 - The proposal to the voters includes the MPD boundary and the members of the board
 - Maximum levy rate of \$0.75/\$1000 AV included in ballot language
 - Simple majority needed for approval

Ms. Hite provided information regarding Special Purpose MPDs:

- City of Des Moines Proposition No. 1
 - Des Moines Resolution No. 1109 proposed creation of the Des Moines Pool MPD
 - Ballot language stated:
 - "...including the authority to levy a general tax on property within the District each year not to exceed twenty cents per thousand dollars of assessed valuation for the purpose of acquiring and operating a pool facility. A five-member board of commissioners, elected at large, shall govern the District."
- Pierce County Proposition No. 1
 - Ballot language stated:
 - "...to levy annually a general tax on all property...not to exceed seventy-five cents per thousand dollars of assessed valuation..."

Ms. Hite explained MPDs are junior taxing districts. The hierarchy is:

- Library
- Hospital
- Fire
- MPD
- Port
- EMS
- Parks & Recreation
- Flood
- Cemetery

Ms. Hite provided the following information regarding property transfer:

- City Property Transfers
 - Cities may transfer land they own to MPDs
 - Land transfers may include "any street, avenue or public area within the city for park or parkway purposes" in addition to park lands
- County property transfers
 - Counties may transfer lands but only "park and recreation lands and equipment"
- Indebtedness
 - MPD assumes indebtedness from all property transfers
 - Edmonds could transfer facilities to the MPD and assign indebtedness for Marina Beach and Frances Anderson Center seismic upgrades

She provided the following points to ponder:

- What services do we need?
- Who is going to provide these services?
- How much will these services cost? (capital and M&O)
 - Consider strategies for capital
- If an MPD, what will the governance structure be?
- If an MPD, what will the boundary be?

- Levy rate?
 - Be wary of promises
 - Consider your future
- Boundaries:
 - Consider the “true” service area
 - Consider the future
- What happens to existing taxes, bonds, levies?
- What if there is more than one MPD in your area?
 - Once an MPD is formed, another cannot be formed with overlapping boundaries
- Only one failed MPD (Covington)

Starting the conversation includes:

- Talking with other MPDs
- Talking to staff
- Connect with other providers
- Consider a strategic planning process – long term visioning
- Don’t focus on the “crisis dwelling units jour”

Ms. Hite recommended exploring a local MPD rather than a regional MPD with the City Council as the governing board, similar to the Transportation Benefit District, a funding mechanism to hold Parks & Recreation services harmless from budget cuts. There is a lot of support for parks from citizens who adopt parks, work in parks, and make donations for flower baskets and other programs such as youth scholarships. In the jurisdiction where she worked previously, Parks & Recreation revenues were increased as well as cuts made such as the city stopped watering grass in neighborhood parks in the summer, removed garbage cans so that staff was not picking up garbage, seasonal staff were laid off and levels of service declined in the summer months. When the prior Mayor asked for budget cuts last year and she proposed cutting the flower program and the pool, highly subsidized programs, she was told those would not be cut and she heard from the public that they wanted those programs. She summarized an MPD was a tool that would help Parks & Recreation as well as the City’s bottom line.

Mr. Hunstock displayed a spreadsheet illustrating potential City savings from an MPD:

Fund	2011 Actuals	Equivalent Levy Rate
001 General Fund	\$2,164,282.10	0.38
125 REET 2 Fund	\$ 215,346.10	0.04
126 REET 1 Parks Acq Fund	\$ 213,692.78	0.04
130 Cemetery Maint/Imp Fund	\$ 3,112.77	0.00
132 Parks Construction Fund	\$ 377,122.64	0.07
(transferred from REET 125 Fund)		
Total Potential Savings	<u>\$2,973,556.39</u>	0.52
Maximum allowable levy		0.75
Difference		0.23
Principal amount of debt that could be funded with difference		<u>\$17,348,541</u>
*Net expenditures, for Parks & Recreation related items only		

Mr. Hunstock summarized if an MPD were formed and capital expenses were moved to the MPD, it would free up approximately \$600,000 in the 125 and 132 Funds for other non-Parks & Recreation related expenses. He explained if the MPD Board decided to levy the maximum amount, it could bond for other projects such as sport field improvements, pool improvements, etc. The City also has a long list of

deferred maintenance related to current facilities; as Finance Director he would not recommend the MPD Board bond up to that amount.

Councilmember Buckshnis commented an MPD is a wonderful, brilliant idea. She inquired about Tukwila's levy rate. Mr. Hunstock answered it was \$0.15/\$1000 AV and was strictly for operation of the pool. Councilmember Buckshnis relayed that would cost an average Edmonds house \$23.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether the senior center could be included. Mr. Hunstock answered yes; the City currently expends approximately \$60,000/year from the General Fund budget for programming activities at the senior center.

Councilmember Buckshnis observed town hall meetings would need to be held if the Council wanted to move forward with an MPD. She asked if the public could be informed in time for the November ballot. If the Council is interested in exploring an MPD, Ms. Hite recommended forming an exploratory citizen committee to discuss the concept and shop it around to determine if there is enough interest to place it on the ballot. That group would then become the advocacy group for the MPD. Staff can provide information in an exploratory phase but once it is placed on the ballot, it will be up to the Council and citizens to advocate for it.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether the strategic planning process was part of an exploratory process. Ms. Hite answered it can be and there was a great deal of support expressed during that process for parks and recreation. There has not been any specific discussion in the strategic planning process about an MPD. An exploratory committee often builds the momentum for such an initiative.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether improvements to Yost Pool could be defined. Ms. Hite cautioned against including specifics but improvements such as to Yost Pool, sports fields, etc. could be mentioned. She explained there is a template that guides the Parks & Recreation Department's work, the City's Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan, which will be updated in 2014. An exploratory committee could begin to identify some of the community's priorities based on that plan.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether the ballot language could state that property taxes would not be increased for the next three years. Ms. Hite answered that could not be included in the ballot language but that intent could be announced to the public.

Councilmember Yamamoto inquired about the timing, whether the intent was the November ballot. Ms. Hite answered the August primary would be too ambitious; November would also be ambitious but it was probably the best timing. A special election in February 2013 would be quite expensive and she would not recommend it immediately following the presidential election because voter turnout would have to be very high. The August 2013 primary includes local elections so would not be the best timing. She concluded if an MPD was not on the November 2012 ballot, strategically it would be pushed to 2014.

Council President Peterson suggested 2-3 Councilmembers form an ad hoc committee. He asked interested Councilmembers to inform him of their interest. If the City formed a local MPD, he asked whether the City could invite other cities to join. Ms. Hite answered no.

8. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Earling recalled a few months ago the Military Veterans Promotion project was launched in Edmonds; participating merchants offer a year-round discount to military families. Today he, along with the Director of Operation Military Family, appeared on King 5's Margaret Larson's New Day Program where he challenged cities throughout the world to participate in the project.

9. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Buckshnis reported Redmond's Finance Director Mike Bailey made a presentation to the Council last Thursday regarding Budgeting by Priorities. She supported the City moving toward that budgeting process.

Council President Peterson requested Councilmembers inform him of any projects/ideas that they want presented to Council during the second quarter. He planned to provide Councilmembers a policy regarding how to best utilize the City Attorney's time. He also plans to work on a policy related to use of styrene.

Council President Peterson relayed Councilmember Plunkett has announced his final day on the Council will be June 4, 2012. An application form will be available online and he will provide Councilmembers a tentative interview schedule. He anticipated the Council would make the appointment on June 5. He encouraged Councilmembers to invite their friends and neighbors to apply.

10. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.